UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,390	12/08/2003	Jeffrey D. Flammer	P03951	4528
28548 7590 05/24/2007 STONEMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD 3113 NORTH 3RD STREET			EXAMINER	
			PATEL, ISHWARBHAI B	
PHOENIX, AZ	85012		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2841	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	05/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/731,390	FLAMMER ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Ishwar (I. B.) Patel	2841					
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS ate, cause the application to become ABAN	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status		•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12	<i>May 2007</i> .						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Th	<u> </u>						
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-40 and 42-50</u> is/are pending in the	e application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-39 is/are withdra	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>18-39</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17 and 40 and 42-50</u> are subject t	to restriction and/or election re	quirement.					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached O	ffice Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	19(a)-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		lication No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri							
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not rec	ceived.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sum						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		ail Date mal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:						

Art Unit: 2841

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on May 21, 2007. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Upon careful study and review of the case, a great deal of confusion was noticed about the newly added claims. During the prosecution of the application, new claims were added. The previous examiner did not examine those claims considering those claims reading on a distinct invention. The applicant traversed that withdrawal of the newly added claims. To make the record clear and to enhance the prosecution of the case, the present examiner has formulated a specie restriction requirement for the elected group of claims 1-17, 40 and 42-50. A new prior art rejection (a non-final rejection) will be issued upon the receipt of the response of this action.

2. Elected Group I, claims 1-17, 40 and 42-50 contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention.

The disclosure is unclear in setting forth how many embodiments are contemplated by the application as various embodiments with different combination are disclosed. As best understood by the examiner, the following specie election requirement is formulated.

Page 3

Feature A:

A1: Rigid layer comprise fiberglass.

A2: Rigid layer comprise epoxy.

A3: Rigid layer comprise metal.

Feature B:

B1: figure 1-11.

B2: figure 12-13.

B3: figure 14-15.

B4: figure 17a-17k.

B5: figure 18a-18e.

B6: figure 19.

B7: figure 20a-20e.

The correct specie will be A1B1, A1B2, A1B3...., etc.

The species are independent or distinct because each of the species has different structural arrangement.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim appears generic.

Page 4

of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

Application/Control Number: 10/731,390 Page 5

Art Unit: 2841

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ishwar (I. B.) Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272 1933. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 - 5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on (571) 272 1984. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/731,390 Page 6

Art Unit: 2841

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ibp May 19, 2007 Ishwar (I. B.) Patel Primary Examiner